



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,798	10/13/2005	Tokuo Tsuura	0445-0352PUS1	8677
2292	7590	01/14/2008	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				CORDRAY, DENNIS R
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1791		
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/14/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/534,798	TSUURA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dennis Cordray	1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2007.  
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-11 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) 1,3-7 and 9-11 is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 8 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/29/07, 12/13/07.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without positively setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 provides for the use of the part for casting, but, since the claim does not positively set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim 8 also recites "the part for casting being disposed in casting sand" but fails to provide any detail regarding how the part is disposed in the casting sand. For example, is the part disposed as part of a casting assembly, such as a gating system, a mold, a core, a vent, a flow-off or some other feature of the casting system? Is the part

some other support feature distinct from the casting assembly, such as a monitoring feature? Is the part buried, partially buried or placed on top of the casting sand?

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-11 are allowable over the cited prior art. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The claimed use of the tubes in metal casting processes places structural limitations on the composition and form of the tubes. The nearest prior art, Brown et al discloses a multi-layer spirally-wound insulating paper sleeve (tubing) for casting metal articles in sand molds. Brown et al teaches that the tubing must be able to resist transfer of heat during the timeframe of solidification of molten metals used in casting yet decompose evenly into harmless ash during the same time period due to the high temperatures (col 4, lines 44-57).

Brown et al teaches that a multi-layered spirally wound sleeve only functions properly if there is a vent or series of vent passages through the sleeve, preferably between each ply or sheet. Without such vents, portions of the sleeve develop hot spots, ignite and decompose more rapidly than other portions of the sleeve thereby destroying the insulating characteristic of the sleeve (col 11, lines 5-27). The disclosed vent passages are created by leaving a gap between adjacent edges of each spiral winding (col 4, lines 38-43; col 7, lines 49-54; Fig. 2). Other prior art discloses tubes for casting that contain an organic and/or an inorganic binder and that are moulded or made from lapped or wound sheets, but fails to disclose spirally-wound tubes with an overlap between adjacent turns (Nagai et al, 4069859; JP-07-3387; JP-09-253792; JP-53-40926; JP-62-154632; JP-11-254091). While edge overlapping is known in general as one process

for winding paper tubes, tubes wound by such a process are specifically taught by Brown et al as being detrimental to the proper function of the tubes in casting operations, thus the claimed tubes are not disclosed in prior art and would not have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Cordray whose telephone number is 571-272-8244. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 7:30 -4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*DRC*  
DRC

*SPG*  
STEVEN P. GRIFFIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700